attempted to effectuate it in defiance of established legal principles, *Ridgeway* v. *Lamphear*, 99 Ind. 251. Still other jurisdictions show an inclination to take advantage of the words of distribution to construe "heirs" as a word of purchase. *Fulton* v. *Harman*, 44 Md. 251.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT—"ARISING OUT OF EMPLOYMENT".—An employee of a master engaged in the business of repairing furnaces, while on his way to do a job of repairing, left the vehicle provided by his employer, to buy tobacco for personal use. In crossing the street to reach the tobacco store he was struck by an automobile and killed. In a proceeding by the widow and children to obtain an award of compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act, *held*, two judges dissenting, there should be no award, the accident not having been one arising "in the course and out of the employment". *In re Betts*, (Ind. App., 1918), 118 N. E. 551.

Emphasis was laid chiefly upon the fact that as the deceased was exposed only to the same hazards on the street as any pedestrian, his employment could not be said to have any causal connection with the injury, hence the accident was not one arising "out of his employment". Among the cases chiefly relied upon for this conclusion are the English cases repudiated by the House of Lords in *Dennis* v. *J. A. White & Co.*, [1917], A. C. 479, commented upon in 16 MICH. L. REV. 179. See *Martin* v. *Lovibond & Sons*, [1914], 2 K. B. 227, where compensation was awarded for an injury received by a drayman in the street while returning to his team after getting a glass of beer.